



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/030,399	01/07/2002	Svyatoslav Ivanovich Arsenich	A34915-PCT USA	8993

21003 7590 09/22/2003

BAKER & BOTTS  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

KOVAL, MELISSA J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2851

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/030,399

Applicant(s)

ARSENICH, SVYATOSLAV  
IVANOVICH

Examiner

Melissa J Koval

Art Unit

2851

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 January 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 0402 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered. In particular, the examiner refers to page 2 of the specification wherein the following is referred to:

"Makartsev V.V., Khesin A. Ya., Steierberg A.L., Large-screen video systems, Moscow, <<Panas>> publishers, 1993, pp. 15-22, 57-83, 96-99, 147-155, Figs. 1, 2 and 22, 23."

### ***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the mirrors, lenses and prisms of claim 2 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Objections***

Claims 6 through 8 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claims 6 and 7, is the phrase "anamorphic" the same as anamorphic? In claim 8, line 15, the examiner suggests changing "stereoscopy system" to -- stereoscopic system --. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: The only structural elements set forth in claim 1 are, "one or a number of projectors" and "a viewing screen". The screen comprises light diffusers. How said elements are structurally and optically connected to one another is not clear from the claim language of claim 1.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 1, "the end-face of the screen" requires further points of reference to better understand how the projection rays are received and deflected by the diffusers on the screen.

Art Unit: 2851

Claims 3-8 are rejected as they depend from rejected claim 1 and said dependent claims suffer from the problems already pointed out with respect to already rejected claim 1.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dubin et al. ('830 B1).

Refer to Figure 3 of Dubin et al., for example.

Claim 1 sets forth: "A projection system (display system 30), comprising one or a number of projectors (one or more projection display modules 31) and a viewing screen (projection screen 35), on said screen light diffusers for diffusing of projection rays being formed (projection screen 35 can be a thin diffusing layer working in combination with prescreen 34),

characterised in that the light diffusers are adapted to capture the projection rays directed from an end-face of the screen across its surface, and subsequently deflect said rays into a sector of observation of an image formed on the screen; and further comprises an optical system that transforms a projected image and registers cross-sections of the projection rays with entrance pupils of the light diffusers formed on the screen so that to provide a depth of sharpness of the projected image over the entire screen surface." Refer to column 7, lines 48 through 56 of Dubin et al.

Refer to Figure 4A of Dubin et al., for example.

Claim 2 sets forth: "The projection system as claimed in claim 1, characterised in that the viewing screen is adapted to perform a projection from a screen end-face onto the frontal and/or reverse, from the viewer side, surface of said screen, for which purpose the light diffusers are implemented in the form of protruding from, or recessed in the screen surface - mirrors, lenses, prisms for capturing, deflecting and diffusing the rays projected from a screen end-face." Refer to prescreen 40 that includes a thin, transparent dual lenticular array structure, as shown.

With respect to claim 3, note that suited to comprise prescreen 40 may include polycarbonate, acetate, vinyl, polyester, acrylic, TAC, PET and other polymer films.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 4-8 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### ***Conclusion***

The art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Chen U.S. Patent 6,600,600 B2 teaches a projection screen and projection method.

Myers U.S. Patent 6,609,799 B1 teaches field-of-view controlling arrangements.

Covannon et al. U.S. Patent 6,543,899 B2 teaches auto-stereoscopic viewing system using mounted projection.

Masaki U.S. Patent 6,601,961 B1 teaches a light guide plate and process for producing the same, surface light source equipment and liquid crystal display.


Colgan et al. U.S. Patent 6,600,528 B2 teaches an integrated prism sheet for improved viewing angle in direct view color filterless liquid crystal displays.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melissa J Koval whose telephone number is (703) 308-4801. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Russell Adams can be reached on Monday through Thursday at (703) 308-2847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9318 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for after final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

MJK

  
RUSSELL ADAMS  
JURY PATENT EXAMINER  
JURY CENTER 2800